

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**CHARLESTON DIVISION**

DIANA L. WOLFE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:14-cv-13479

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's Brief in Support of Judgment on the Pleadings ("Plaintiff's Motion"), (ECF No. 13), and Defendant's Brief in Support of Defendant's Decision ("Defendant's Motion"), (ECF No. 14). By Standing Order entered on February 7, 2014 and filed in this case on May 1, 2014, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge R. Clarke VanDervort for submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition. (ECF No. 4.) Magistrate Judge VanDervort filed his PF&R on August 31, 2015, in which he recommends that this Court grant Plaintiff's Motion, deny Defendant's Motion, reverse the final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (the "Commissioner"), remand this case, and dismiss this matter from the Court's docket. (ECF No. 16.)

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Plaintiff's right to appeal this

Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

Objections to the PF&R in this case were due by September 17, 2015. (*See* ECF No. 16 at 14–15.) To date, the parties have not filed any objections.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R, (ECF No. 16), **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion, (ECF No. 13), **DENIES** Defendant's Motion, (ECF No. 14), **REVERSES** the final decision of the Commissioner, **REMANDS** this case for further proceedings pursuant to the fourth sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and **DISMISSES** this action from the docket of the Court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: September 18, 2015

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Thomas E. Johnston', is written over a horizontal line.

THOMAS E. JOHNSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE